

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS


The Examiner states that the inventions of Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features in that the special technical feature of Group I is the claimed pH-sensitive polymer and the process for preparing same and this feature is not present in Group II and the special technical feature of Group II is a medicinal substance and this feature is not present in Group I.

However, it can be seen that unity of invention exists between the claims of Groups I and II by the fact that the pH-sensitive polymer is recited in the claims of Groups I and II, since the claims of Group II specifically refer to the pH-sensitive polymer according to Claim 1 of Group I in the claims of Group II. Therefore, it is submitted that unity of invention exists between the claims of Groups I and II and it is requested that the Examiner rejoin the claims of Groups I and II and examine all claims in the present application.

Accordingly, for the reasons presented above, it is submitted that the Patent and Trademark Office has failed to meet the burden necessary to sustain the Restriction Requirement. Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
Norman F. Oblon



Roland E. Martin  
Registration No. 48,082

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)